Calendar No. 347

99TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
99-158

AUTHORIZING THE DESIGN OF A BUILDING OR BUILDINGS ADJACENT TO UNION STATION

OCTOBER 16 (legislative day OCTOBER 15), 1985.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1706]

The Committee on Environment and Public Works, to which was referred the bill (S. 1706), a bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol, in cooperation with the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, to design a building or buildings adjacent to Union Station in Washington, DC, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill (as amended) do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

For a number of years, the Committee on Environment and Public Works has sought to preserve and renew Union Station in Washington, DC.

Prior to the creation of Amtrak, Congress enacted legislation to convert Union Station to a National Visitors Center. Tens of millions of dollars were spent to begin construction on a parking garage and the conversion of the Station. Following a series of cost overruns, the project was abandoned and the structure closed.

In 1981, Congress passed the Union Station Redevelopment Act as Public Law 97-125, the purpose of which was to revive Union Station as a station for Amtrak, while attracting new commercial development into this beautiful old building.

As a part of Public Law 97-125, Congress included a provision that permitted the Department of Transportation, which is responsible for the renewal of Union Station, to obtain from the Architect of the Capitol the use of two squares (721 and 722) located north of

71-010 O

S323-15

Massachusetts Avenue in the District of Columbia. These two squares are a part of the United States Capitol Grounds, and for the past decade have been used as open, ground-level parking for Senate staff.

In considering that 1981 law, Congress took the position, which remains valid, that development on these squares should enhance the revival of Union Station, and must occur in a manner that is complementary to the Station's redevelopment.

But because the Department of Transportation has not requested use of those squares, control over this land remains uncertain. While the land remains a part of the Capitol Grounds, it also remains subject to the DOT option that has not been exercised.

When it became clear that both the Union Station Redevelopment Act and the Master Plan for the United States Capitol projected construction of a Federal structure on Squares 721 and 722, discussion began to focus on the possibility of locating there the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and related activities.

The Administrative Office confronts serious housing problems. In fiscal year 1986, its 635 employees, plus another 122 persons assigned to the Federal Judiciary Center, will be scattered among eight buildings in Washington. Many of these offices are several miles from the Supreme Court, to which these agencies are ultimately responsible.

At a Committee hearing, witnesses endorsed the use of Squares 721 and 722 as a location to house the Administrative Office. The key policy issue that was identified concerned the financing of such development. The alternatives suggested were:

—Authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to spend $70.5 million directly to build the project.

—Directing the Department of Transportation, through the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, to exercise its existing authority to develop the site.

—Permitting a private developer to develop the property, then lease a portion of it to the Administrative Office.

S. 1706 seeks to resolve these alternatives in a manner that expedites planning on a building or buildings, while assuring retention of a proper and effective level of public control.

The bill authorizes $2 million to be appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol, who will then conduct a three-stage investigation that would be carried out in concert with the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, as follows:

(1) An assessment of the size of a building suitable for the site and needed for the judiciary groups, including offices for retired Justices of the Supreme Court, plus other offices, shops, and restaurants. It is important to note that the building is expected to contain a variety of use, in line with the goals of the Public Building Cooperative Use Act (Public Law 94-541), as well as other space, including offices, that would be rented or leased. The Committee on Environment and Public Works developed the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act; this Committee continues to support strongly the goals of that Act.

(2) An architectural competition will be held to select a design, followed by whatever planning can be accomplished within the money and time available.

(3) An assessment, including solicitation of actual proposals, of the opportunity for a public-private partnership to develop the site, with non-public sources financing all or a portion of the structure, with the judicial groups paying rent for use of the property.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1.—This section directs the Architect of the Capitol to file a report by August 15, 1986, with recommendations, to four Congressional Committees: The two Committees on Appropriations and the two Committees on Public Works. The report will be on the potential construction on squares 721 and 722 in the District of Columbia of a building or buildings for the use of the administrative office of the United States Courts, the Federal Judicial Center, and other judicial functions.

In cooperation with the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, the Architect shall seek:

—To make a study of alternatives on the size, design, and estimated cost of constructing a building or buildings on those squares to meet the current and future needs of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and related agencies of the Federal judiciary, together with such other commercial, governmental, cultural, educational, and recreational activities as may appropriately occupy such building or buildings in a manner that benefits the United States.

—To find ways to utilize those two squares in a manner that complements the surrounding area, and in particular fulfills the goals of mixed use contained in the Public Building Cooperative Use Act, and is not inconsistent with either the master plan for the United States Capitol or the intent of section 116 of Public Law 97-125.

—Third, the report shall make specific recommendations on the most feasible and most economical methods for financing and constructing such building or buildings in the shortest possible time.

To assure timely action by Congress, the Architect is expected to file interim reports with the committees. This is an important provision. These timely, interim reports will help Congress keep abreast of developments.

Section 2.—This section requires the Architect, as soon as possible, to contract with the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, to develop a program of space utilization that will accommodate the current and future needs of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and related agencies providing for the renting, leasing, or use of any space not needed immediately by the administrative agencies of the Federal judiciary.

For example, the best proposal might be a building far larger than needed simply to accommodate the Administrative Office and related agencies. Such a building could include restaurants, shops, and other offices.

The section also states specifically that no space in the building or buildings shall be rented or leased to anyone having business before, or whose business would be incompatible with the mission of, the Administrative Office.

In addition, subsection (a) requires that the Architect and the Corporation develop a plan that will be compatible with the authorized redevelopment of Union Station and with other developments in the vicinity, including residential neighborhoods.

Subsection (b) directs the Architect, in cooperation with the Corporation, to devise and undertake a limited and selected competition for the selection of an architect for this building or buildings. The winner is to be selected on the basis of the excellence of design. design.

Such a competition is expected to involve the selection of half a dozen or so leading architects, each of whom would be paid a sum, probably $10,000 to $25,000, to develop a basic, preliminary design for the site. If architectural design contract can be worked out, work would begin at once on detailed design.

Such an open process can be expected to produce a building design of great architectural merit, one befitting the magnificence of the setting next to Union Station.

Finally, subsection (c) requires the Corporation and the Architect to recommend to Congress ways that will minimize or eliminate the initial capital investment in such project by the United States through the use, when appropriate, of a public-private partnership to finance and construct such projects, provided that the property remains in the ownership of the United States.

The Committee expects the Corporation to solicit proposals from non-governmental sources for financing to lessen or eliminate any need for a direct Federal capital investment.

The section requires that the land remain in Federal ownership.

Section 3.—This section authorizes $2,000,000 to be appropriated to the Architect in the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, with that sum to remain available until expended for the purposes of this act.

HEARINGS

On July 17, 1985, the Committee on Environment and Public Works conducted a hearing on the options for Squares 721 and 722.

ROLLCALL VOTES

Section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and the rules of the Committee on Environment and Public Works require that any rollcall votes be announced in this report. During the committee's consideration of this bill, no rollcall votes were taken. The measure was unanimously ordered reported.

COST OF LEGISLATION

In accordance with section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office has prepared a report on the costs to be incurred by the Federal Government resulting from the enactment of this bill. Such cost estimates are set forth below:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 10, 1985.

Hon. ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, 410 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for S. 1706, a bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol, in cooperation with the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, to design a building or buildings adjacent to Union Station in Washington, DC.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER, *Director.*

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—COST ESTIMATE

OCTOBER 10, 1985.

1. Bill number: S. 1706.

2. Bill title: A bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol, in cooperation with the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, to design a building or buildings adjacent to Union Station in Washington, DC.

3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, October 10, 1985.

4. Bill purpose: The bill authorizes the appropriation of $2 million to the Architect of the Capitol for fiscal year 1986 for the study and design of an office building for the administrative agencies of the Federal judiciary. The bill would require the Architect to report his recommendations to the Congress by August 15, 1986.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—				
	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Authorization level	2.0				
Estimated outlays	1.9	0.1			

The costs of this bill fall within budget function 800.

Basis of Estimate: This estimate assumes the amount authorized will be appropriated. The estimate of outlays is based on information from the Architect of the Capitol's office.

6. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.

7. Estimate comparison: None.

8. Previous CBO estimate: None.

9. Estimate prepared by: James Hearn.

10. Estimate approved by: C.G. Nuckols (for James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis).

REGULATORY IMPACT EVALUATIONS

Subsection 5 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate require the committee to evaluate the regulatory impact of the reported bill. It is not anticipated that this bill will impose any significant new regulatory burden.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is reported that this bill effects no change in existing law.

○